

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,532	12/05/2003	John F. Van Itallie	MI22-2458	8286
21567	7590 02/09/2006		EXAMINER	
WELLS ST	Γ. JOHN P.S.	DUDA, KATHLEEN		
	ST AVENUE, SUITE 1300	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SPOKANE,	, WA 99201		1756	
			DATE MAILED, 02/00/200	

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/728,532	VAN ITALLIE ET AL.		
Office Action Summ	nary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Kathleen Duda	1756		
- The MAILING DATE of this Period for Reply	communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	idress	
 Failure to reply within the set or extended per 	A THE MAILING DA e provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 of this communication. naximum statutory period w iod for reply will, by statute, ee months after the mailing	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the	L. the mailing date of this commons (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
 1) Responsive to communication 2a) This action is FINAL. 3) Since this application is in conclused in accordance with the 	2b)⊠ This ondition for allowar	action is non-final.		e merits is	
Disposition of Claims					
	is/are withdraved. d. ted to. to restriction and/or to by the Examiner is/are: a) acces any objection to the coincluding the correction	election requirement. T. Potential or bound of the Education of the Edu	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 Cl	• •	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) I) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12052003.	Review (PTO-948) D-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te)-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/728,532 Page 2

Art Unit: 1756

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-38 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 9 and 16 have been amended with limitations whose teaching could not be found in the originally filed specification.

Claims 27 and 33 recite that the first pattern is interspersed in the second pattern. In addition, claim 27 recites that no portion of the photosensitive material is exposed to both patterns. These teachings could not be found in the originally filed specification.

Application/Control Number: 10/728,532

Art Unit: 1756

Double Patenting

Page 3

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1-38 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,670,109. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both recite a process of forming overlapping exposure patterns. A restriction requirement was not made in the patented case.

Application/Control Number: 10/728,532 Page 4

Art Unit: 1756

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murooka (US Patent 6,248,508).

Murooka teaches a process of forming a circuit element. The process involves a first exposure followed by movement of the mask before a second exposure. This is depicted in Figures 2A to 2C. Column 2, lines 47-52, teaches that the mask or wafer can moved between the exposures. Figure 2B depicts the overlap that occurs with the two exposures. Figures 12A to 12M depict the circuit formation using the plural exposure of the resist layer. The photoresist 8 is exposed as described above and then developed to form a photoresist pattern which is then used in the etching and material deposition to form the circuit (see Figures 12H to 12M).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used a double exposure to form a photoresist pattern used in making an electrical device because Murooka teaches that the double exposure with overlap produces a pattern smaller than resolution (column

Application/Control Number: 10/728,532 Page 5

Art Unit: 1756

11, lines 62-65). The recitation of the pattern extended through the entirety would be obvious because it is taught that etching will occur which will require the pattern extending through the depth of the layer.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner K. Duda at (571) 272-1383. Official FAX communications should be sent to (571) 273-8300.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Huff, can be reached at 571-272-1385.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kathleen Duda Primary Examiner Art Unit 1756